மாவட்ட ஆட்சியர

ஆவணம்

மதுரை

VOL NO 74

மதுரை மாவட்ட ஆட்சியர்

ஆவணம்.

VOL. NO. 74

ரா. கையல்நாயகி (பா.ஏ)
செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர்

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் 2/03

செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த நாள் 5/03

28.7.03

சரிபார்க்கும் மு.நி.பா.எ. கையொப்பம்

28/7/03

List of Records sent to Vice Pres[illegible]
with reference to Circ No 1313 of 9[illegible]

1 A file of letters containing [illegible]
sheets ending with a letter from
Govt dated 15th Nov 1809.

2 List of pension of [illegible] the
family of Sathupady of Ramnad
forwarded to B^d on the 20 Aug
1830

3. Arzi from Vijaya Raghunath
Sadupa[illegible] dated 13 June 23 Nov [illegible]

4. Two lists dated 12 and 14 Apr[illegible]
83 showing the distribution [illegible]
of pensions & pay to the family
& servants of Late Poligar of [illegible]
Ramnad received from the [illegible]
of Ramnad

5 [illegible] list dated 16
1874 showing the number [illegible]
the family of the late [illegible]
=malingal [illegible]

2

Received Deposition of

Meenakshisundram, Peon of

Periyakulam Taluk, given

before the Sub Collector

regarding the Pound Fund

Collections

13/5/95

Recd from EHB

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 8 — [illegible] 2 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] — 8 — [illegible]

[illegible]

94 [illegible] } [illegible] 11 — 4 —

[illegible] } [illegible] 11 — 4 —

[illegible] 9 [illegible]

[illegible] } [illegible] 10 —

[illegible] 8 [illegible]

93 [illegible] } [illegible] 1 —

[illegible]

[illegible] 3 — 12

[illegible]

[illegible] 30 [illegible] — 9 — 8 —

9 — 1 — 95 [illegible]

[illegible] — 37 — 8 —

[illegible]

[illegible]

11 — 1 — 98 [illegible]

40

A

1894.

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

Printed January 22nd.

Proceedings, 8*th January* 1894, *No.* 3.

Communicating to Collectors, for information and guidance, Government Order approving Board's proposals for amending Standing Order No. 226 (Old Edition) regarding grant of copies of documents to parties, and stating that the necessary Standing Order slip will be issued.

48

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(LAND REVENUE).

READ—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 5th December 1893, Mis. No. 6713.

ABSTRACT.—Stating that the orders of Government should be awaited, as regards the introduction of copy-stamped papers in the Madras district, proposed in paragraph 2 of Board's Proceedings, dated 13th October 1893, No. 592.

READ—also the following Government Order, dated 5th December 1893, No. 1052, Revenue:—

Read—Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 13th October 1893, No. 592.

ABSTRACT.—Amending Standing Order No. 2 (Old Edition) relating to the grant of copies to parties so as to include the rules issued under section 91 of the Indian Registration Act, and re-issuing it embodying also the orders regarding the levy of search fees and the collection of copying fees in the shape of copy-stamped papers.

Order—dated 5th December 1893, No. 1052, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

The Board's proposals in paragraphs 2 and 3 of its Proceedings read above are approved, and the following notification will be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*:—

NOTIFICATION.

In Notification No. 444, dated 1st August 1893 published at pages 1005-6 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 29th August 1893,

For the words

"2½ annas per page of 240 words if in English, and 2 annas if in the Vernacular" occurring in rule 5, clause 2,

Read

"Two annas in cash for every 175 words or fraction thereof."

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
„ Superintendent, Government Press, with notification.

RESOLUTION—dated 8th January 1894 No. 3.

Communicated to all Collectors in continuation of Board's Proceedings, dated 13th October 1893, No. 592, for information and guidance.

2. The necessary Standing Ordership will be issued.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. S. MEYER,
Secretary.

(True Copy).

(Signed) C. CLARK,
Registrar.

To all Collectors.

Copy to the Conservators of Forests.
" " Board of Revenue (Settlement Branch).
" " " " (Separate Revenue).

s Theo 71 of 86 6

The enclosed is an ap[illegible] for copies of the Jamabandi accoun[ts for] Faslis 1230 & 1232 of all the [De]vastanam & chattram villages [of the] Ramnad Zemindari. There are [a]bout 366 Devastanam & 67 chattram villages. Each village has [a] separate sheet for its Jamabandi & copies are to be furnished separa[tely] for each village.

But the Jamabandi accounts for one fasli for all the villages are kept together [illegible] in one duftar (Devastanams being kept separate from [the] chattrams).

I doubt whether [illegible] be levied separately for [each villa]ge or one search fee will [do for] the whole (for one year).

[illegible] B.P. No. 213 / 27-6-95 may, I think, [be] well be applied to the present case as the party applies for cop[ies] of the whole accounts and the work does not involve any [illegible] labor for search. If so, two search fees one for the Jamabandi accounts of De[vastanam] villages & one for chattram [villages] may be levied in the [present] case. Please favour me [illegible]

This is a case where [illegible]
fee has to be paid for the
[illegible]ment of each village
a sort fee paid by
[illegible]ty for telling informa[illegible]
[illegible]t the document & of
[illegible] for the document
[illegible] As the docu[illegible]

7

Dear Copeland

I think the 2 docum[ents]

relate to the one

subject - refor[m]

done [illegible].

for the 1st No 8

for the 2d - 4 should

be covered -

One copy is al[so]

required for [illegible]

I think they are two

different documents

[illegible] is the order heading

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] of the 2 no. the

[illegible] report of [illegible]

taken at [illegible]

[illegible] document is also

[illegible]

re [illegible] quarter

[illegible] to the pyramid

[illegible] formation of the [illegible]

[illegible] such other thing, the

[illegible] taken to be [illegible] acter S

[illegible] subject; and [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] to be a diff[illegible]

[illegible] movement [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] purposes [illegible]

[illegible] sight [illegible]

[illegible] Two

[illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] to write [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] taught [illegible]

If the [illegible] Treats [illegible]

[illegible] subject; then

I think all [illegible]

about the [illegible]

[illegible] may also be [illegible]

[illegible] in the same [illegible]

but,

8

I think they 2 [illegible] are chargeable related [illegible] to the same [illegible] as no 1. [illegible] each a fee [illegible] to be chargeable [illegible]

28/9/[illegible]

Items 1. in the Ptn.
is an order of the
Collector to the [illegible]
& item 2 is an
argt from the lett[illegible]
to be form[illegible]
reply to the ord[illegible]

I am in doubt [illegible]
whether these
documents are
to be taken as [illegible]
subject to a
search fee of [illegible]
8 as to the first
& [illegible] to the 2d. [illegible]
document [illegible] to
be collected und[illegible]
Rules 1 & 3 or 7
different [illegible]

fear

arse to the
tory/as diff

The file of
is put up
reference.

In fact it is
be cleared
the 2d. docum
is the same
as the [illegible] with
[illegible].

I [illegible] request
you will be plea
to clear my d
as I am ready of
put in Confusi
on the subject.

M S.

28-9-96

Sir, To - The English Hd Clerk -

9 In the enclosed petition, the petitioner applies for copy of Sowmyan account for the maniyam attached to 9 servants of Kondagai village, namely, ambalam, Curnam, Totty etc. The entries pro the different maniyams are different & find place separately in the same olai account. But as I one

As the maniyams are different though for one village, I think they are to be treated as different subjects for the purpose of search fees. put up: —

Under B.P. 592 / 13.4.93

But in B.P. No 213 / 27.8.95 the Board ~~have~~ ordered the levy of a ... fee for all papers filed together

to form one record. The reference
there is with regard to a Magl.
Case in which a further search will
not be necessary for any addl. documt.
that may be required. The same
may be applicable to a file of
any other correspondence also.

In my opinion, the B. Tabac
referred to is not applicable to the
present case (Olai account
which contains entries for the whole
for different mambams
[illegible]) ~~[illegible]~~

Subs. Nanam
~~[illegible]~~ 15th

For orders as to levy
of search fee in the present
case.

In cases where the parties apply
for two mambams of the same village
2 search fees are being levied now.
Treasury Dy.
Yours sly.
[illegible]

[illegible]
does not
The Magl. file
is different
from an Olai
account of the
[illegible] of a big
[illegible]. [illegible]

[illegible]
8/9/
One fee .. will
not suffice. [illegible]

If the B.O.
had been applied
to [illegible] cases
[illegible]
there [illegible] a loss of
revenue.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
10 (Land Revenue)

MADURA DISTRICT RECEIVED 3 AUG. 95 TREASURY

[illegible] No. 3808 of 189[illegible]
Date 1808

Read — the following letter from Herbert Bradley, Esq., District Magistrate of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Coimbatore, 19th June 1895, Ref.-on: C. No. 866–Magte.: —

I have the honor to submit the following for the Board's orders.

2. In the rules for the inspection and grant of copies of public documents, the fee for searching the records of any one year for a single document or entry is eight annas, and that for every additional document or entry connected with the same subject is four annas. I request to be informed whether a person applying for a number of depositions relating to one magisterial case ought to pay a single fee of eight annas for all the depositions or a fee of eight annas for the first deposition and four annas for every additional deposition.

I make this enquiry as I find that in a large number of offices in this district a fee of eight annas is charged for the first deposition with four annas each for every other deposition in the same record. In the rest of the district a single fee of eight annas covers any number of depositions from one record. There is no labour involved in finding subsequent papers when they are all contained in one magisterial record and it appears to me that a search fee of annas eight is the proper charge whatever the number of copies provided they all come from one record. But as the practice varies in different places, I request the favor of definite orders.

Resolution – dated 27th June 95, No. 213.

The Board agrees with the Collector.

2. The provisions of Rule 2 of Standing Orders No. 226 (Cl. Edition) must be held to govern Rule 3, and only one search fee is required for all papers filed together to form one record.

(True copy & Extract) (Sd) R. A. Carr
Ag: Secy

([illegible] copy) (Sd) [illegible]
2nd Asst.

2850
N. 8[illegible]

(True copy)

Communicated to the Treasury D. [illegible] for information [illegible]
[illegible]

11

Collector's Circular published in the District Gazette Madura dated 2nd June 1890. Page 149.

The Collector's attention has lately been drawn to the presentation of "admission order" on application for copies and return of documents long after such orders are passed. In some cases th[ey] are presented in the Record after the lapse of a year or two. It appears th[at] a common practice for petitioners to keep the order with them and produce it in the Record at their convenience. The Collector considers that there should be some restriction as to the period within which the applicants should produce [in] the Record the "admission order" and get copies and or return of documents as the case may be and accordingly directs that [...] copies re[...]

Record keepers in the Huzur Office or
any Such Officer in the Taluq and
Divisional Offices within 3 (three)
months from the date of order on Such
titions.

2. Petitioners are also informed that
ir names and full address should be
ven in the petitions presented by them.
petitions will be retained in the Office
7 days after the date of the order for
livery in person to the petitioners. If not
ken delivery within that time, the
titions will be sent post bearing.

(Signed) E. Turner
Collector

12

12

Circular Memo

The undersigned observes that certain Collectors are in the habit of granting of extracts from the Preliminary Vernacular Register prepared by the Local authorities for the information of the Inam Dy Collr containing also the decision of the Dy Collector. These decisions being nothing more than the Dy Collector's opinions and recommendations have no force whatever until they are confirmed by the Inam Commission and title deeds issued to the parties accordingly. Coll[ecto]rs are therefore [illegible] not to [illegible] concerne[d] [illegible] the Pre[liminary] Registers [illegible] -but [illegible]

I. C. A.

(True copy)

Communicated to the Tay Dy. Collector for information

(Sd) M. Seenevasa Row
For Collector

M. C. C.
7-5-90

No 1017
10-5-90

Copy Communicated to the Vernacular Record Keeper Huzur for careful attention to the instructions contained in the concluding portion of the Inam Commissioner's Circular

(Sd) T. Renga Row
Tay Dy. Collector

(True copy)

Circular Memo

The undersigned observes
that certain Collectors are in the
habit of granting of extracts
from the Preliminary Vernacular
Register prepared by the local
authorities for the information
of the Inam Dy. Collector and
containing also the decision of
the Dy. Collector. These becomes
being nothing more than the
Dy. Collector's opinion and re-
commendations have no force
whatever until they are confirmed
by the Inam Commissioner
and title deeds issued to
the parties accordingly. Collectors
are therefore requested not to
grant to the parties concerned
any extracts from the Prelim.
Vernacular Register until after
the [illegible]tion of the title deeds
[illegible] ch No. 1 [illegible]
IC [illegible] Inam Commr.

Kindly
Communicated to the Secretary to
Collector for information
M Muraraker
Elder
M. C. O.
7-5-90
No 1017
10-5-90
Copy Communicated to the Vernacular
Record Keeper Hazur for
careful attention to the instructions
contained in the concluding
portion of the Main Commissioner's
circular.
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
19-5-90
[illegible]

G. No.
9 9 5 92
23

J. 94/No. 18 Memo 14

In continuation of this office Memo Circular No. 7/18/3/92 the vernacular Record keeper is hereby ordered to make use of plain papers also in the case of copies of Inam or other long statements &c which cannot be got on to the stamped paper

Srinivasachar
20/5/92 for Dy. Collector

No 12

1699 / 95

1 15

The Collector of
Madura

Respected Sir,

I beg to report that of the records marked D by the Temporary Establishment for sorting and indexing the old records about 186 dufters and 45 files as shown below are eligible for immediate destruction and to request that necessary sanction may be accorded for the same.

Tamil dufters	~~126~~	143
Hindui dufters	~~42~~	43
Total	~~168~~	186

Sent Letters files	3
Board files	39
Government files	13
Total	45

Description of re...

1. D papers of the Boa... of 1817 to 1844 ...
2. Do. of Sent Letters ... of 1844 an...
3. Do. of Government files of 1828 to 1843
4. Pound keepers accounts ... of 1884 to 28...

Returns of births and deaths &c of 1892
(received from the Taluqs).

6. Attendance Registers of 1875 to 1887

7. Permit files of 1877 to 1880 & 1882 to 1887.

8. Stationary accounts of 1878 to 1887.

9. Miscellaneous records such as invoices of Treasury remittance, acknowledgements &c of 1808, 1810, 1812 to 1817, 1826 to 1828

10. Accounts currents (received from Taluqs) of 1871 to 1889.

11. Treasury Day books &c of 1858 to 1865

~~12.~~ Daily Cash accounts &c (~~received from Taluqs~~) of 1814, 1824 and 1826 to 1828.

13. Stamp accounts &c (received from Taluqs) of 1872 to 1877 and 1882 to 1883.

14. Cash balance accounts and reports (received from Taluqs) of 1875 to 1877, 1879 to 1881, 1883 ~~and~~ to 1885.

[illegible] miscellaneous accounts such as Deposit [illegible]ters, adjust memos, fine statements, [illegible]use Tax accounts &c (received from [Talu]qs &c) & routine correspondence of 1860 to 1865, & 1877 to 1888 [illegible]o & 1804 to 1807.

[illegible] a customs account (received from Taluqs) of 1881 to 1888.

(17) Re[illegible] of Pattah transfers of fasli[illegible]
[illegible]

18. Population accounts of faslies 1240 & 124[illegible]

19. Shari list of fasli 12[illegible] 16

20. Collection accounts of faslies 1259, & 1268 and of the year 1882.

21. Darkast records of ~~faslies~~ 1862 & 1863

22. Pay abstracts of fasli 1268

23. Cultivation accounts of faslies 1219, 122[illegible] 1240, 1242, 1261, 1262, 1263 & 1268.

24. Miscellaneous Kyfeits of faslies 1240, 124[illegible] 1246 to 1249, & 1259 to 1266

25. Reports &c regarding the state of the season of fasli 1265

26. Progress reports &c of repairs of 1863 & 1874

27 Miscellaneous records connected with the Jamabandy.

28. A rough accounts of Inam accounts of fasli 11 ([illegible])

29 - Records connected with the monthly returns of sales under act II of 1864, notices & [illegible] Correspondence & [illegible] accounts &c of 1871 to [illegible] 1877 & [illegible]

6.7 ~~12/3~~/95 2/4/95

(Q-i)

30 Returns of crops of 1884 & correspondence connected therewith, abkari lists of shops & muchalikas &c.

31. Laum orders issued to native accountants during 1860 to 76.

No. 74
14.2.94

17

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue)

× + + × ×

Read – also the following letter from C. D. Macleane Esqre, Collector of Nellore to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Nellore, 27th December 1893, No. 12 Engl:–

(3)

× × + + × ×

Resolution – dated 14th February 1894 No. 74.

Recorded.

(2) With reference to paragraph 3 of the Collector's letter, the Board concurs in the opinion therein expressed by him & accordingly directs that the annual reports on District records shall in future be prepared for the Calendar instead instead of for the Official year

as at present and shall be Sub-
mitted by 1st March of each
year. The reports for the
past year, however may
be Submitted by 1st April next.

(3) In this Connection the Board
resolves to issue revised
instructions as to the form
in which the reports should
be Submitted.

+ + + + +

18

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (~~Separate Revenue~~)

Dated the 16th day of March 1896.

No. 119.

READ— Again B. P. (Separate Revenue), No. 521 dated 8th November 1893

Abstract — Communicating to Dy and Assistant Commi-ssioners Board's Proceedings (Land Revenue) amending Standing Order no. 226 (old edition) relating to the grant of copies of records to parties so as to include the rules issued under section 91 of the Indian Registration Act, and re-issuing it embodying also the orders regarding the levy of search fees and the Collection of copying fees in the Shape of copy-stamped papers.

Resolution — No. 119, dated 16th March 1896.

The Board resolves to direct that, in granting copies of records, each statement, account, report or the like should be treated as a separate document and should be written on separate copy-stamped papers. The stamps that should be affixed to the copies under article 9, Schedule I of the Court fees Act, should be calculated with reference to the number of words contained in each separate state-ment, account &c.

(A true Extract)
(Sd.) — D. Murdock
Secretary

(True copy)
(Sd.) Edmund Millett
Assistant Secy.

Dis no. 1570 / 29-4-96 (True copy)

Communica[ted] to the Huzur Record Keeper ...

... [illegible]

No: 170/Rd. M. S. Pillai attend to this at once & file — 2-5-96 [illegible]

189

From

The COLLECTOR OF

MADURA.

To

The

No.

Enclosures.

Dated }
Received } 189 .

Subject.

[illegible]
2/5

Circular 19

It is frequently observed that the copyists' remuneration bill presented for payment is not properly prepared. The different sections (i.e.) should be separately shown (i.e.) copyists should be entered in one section and and examiners in other. The total for each section should be in red ink. vide Article 58 of the Civil Account Code.

2 The bill should also invariably be accompanied by the monthly statement showing the number and disposal of applications; otherwise, the bill will be returned unpassed.

Wd/ [illegible]

Treasury Dy Collector

To all Sub Treasury officers & Stationary Sub Magistes
Copy to all Divl officers for information

Recorded
[illegible]
13/6/96.

No. 363
Ad. Supdt.
H. M. [illegible]
please attend
to this at
once. [illegible]
7/9.

Dis No. 2835 of 1896

20

Rubber stamp endorsement on copies of documents granted to parties.

1. Application for copy received by Collector on ......
2. Order granting copy despatched on......
3. Do Do produced before Ty. Dy Collector } ......
4. Stamp papers &c called for ......
5. Do produced — " ......
6. Copy ready
7. Copy delivered or sent by post } ......

The Treasury Dy Collector is requested to make early arrangements for noting the information required by the 7 headings given above, on all copies of documents granted to parties in future.

(Signed) J. F. Bryant
For Collector.

Madura }
19.8.96

(True Copy)

Communicated to the Huzur Eng. Record Keeper for information and guidance.

2. A [illegible] rubber stamp containing the above information has been applied for. In the meanwhile the Record Keeper will enter the information required by the 7 heads in all copies issued in manuscript.

[illegible]
Ty. Dy. Collector

21 2

Copies from the entries in the copy books maintained in the record of the several important Cadjan accounts in easy w[h]ere the original cadjan ones have disappeared having been torn or owing to duration of time, which has been followed for the past many years, may be continued.

It appears also that some of the copy books are being filed in Courts & ~~returned~~ apparently admitted in evidence.

How often has this been done within the last 4 year. You denies that this procedure was being followed

[illegible]

[illegible]

Dy. Dy Collr.

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

for orders

The enclosed is an application from
...e Muthuramalinga Tevar for a copy
of the boundary account of Sathana
puram village, Sivaganga Zemindari.

Cadjan account No 28 is the
original account giving the
boundaries of all the villages of
the Sivaganga Zemindari and the
Cadjan olais, leaves are Consecutively
numbered.

A true Copy of the above account
appears to have been prepared on
paper in 1858 and is maintained
... the record, Compared by the ~~[illegible]~~ Clerks
... the Sivaganga Zemin office and
signed by the then Record Keeper &
... Head Sheristadar. In the Copy
book, the page No given to the leaves
... olais in the original Cadjan accounts
... quoted against the respective
entries.

In the Copy book, there is entry
... Sathanapuram the village in
question, between ...s 642 & 643,
... no number is quoted against
... entry itself. On looking into
... original Cadjan Account No 28
... an leaf Containing the above
... ... for the village

in question.

In cases where the ...
leaves in the original accoun...
missing, or torn or otherwise ...
Copies are being given of the
entries in the Copy book.

In the present case it is n...
known how the Copy was made
in the absence of the olai in the
original account.

Probably there might have been
a leaf Containing the above entr...
(without number) in the original
account at the time when the cop...
was prepared. ~~and [illegible]~~
Subsequently it shd have been lost or ~~having~~ been torn ...
owing to duration of time as is th...
case with many olais Cadjans
in some of the accounts.

For orders as to whether ...
Copy may be given in the
present case from the entr...
in the Copy book. We cannot
say whether it is the copy of an origi...

[illegible]
13/10

M.S.
4/10

~~[illegible]~~

It is further requested
that ... the practice of ...

Respected Sir,

22

In obedience to your order, I beg to state that no copies were ever granted of the entries in the copy books while there were original cadjan leaves in existence; but only in cases where the original cadjan leaf has been torn. (while preparing copy of an account) A copy is usually granted from the entry in the copy book for that portion.

There may not be many cases of the kind during one year & it is now difficult to find them out.

I beg to remain,
Respected Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
M. Subramaniam pillay
Record keeper

22-10-96.

Rec 653 of 96.

Memo for orders

...atter ... [illegible] Sub...
...mindar of Sivaganga ... [illegible]
...a copy of the ... [illegible]
...count of Sattanapuram village,
...ivaganga Zamindari.

Cadjan account no 28 in the
...nal account ... [illegible] Sivaganga
...the villages of the Sivaganga
...dari and the Cadjan (olai
...es are consecutively numbered.

~~...true copy of the above accoun~~
...well as other important Cadjan
...ounts relating to Ramnad and
...aganga Zamindaries appears
...ave been prepared on paper
1858 and is maintained in
record, compared by the clerks
the Zamin Office and signed by
Record Keeper, the Head
...ishtadar and the Collector.
...me of the copy books, Collector's signature
...ature has not been
...ined. In the copy books
...age no given to the leaves
...s) in the original Cadjan
...count is quoted against the
...pective entries.

In the copy book of account
...28, there is entry for Sattana...

23 between nos 642 & 643, but
number is quoted against the
entry itself. On looking in
the original Cadjan account
no 28, no Cadjan leaf containing
the above entry is found for the
village in question. It is not
known how the copy was made
in the absence of the olai in the
original account. Probably there
might have existed a leaf con-
taining the above entries (without
numbers) in the original account
at the time when the copy was
prepared. Subsequently it should
have been lost or torn ... owing
to duration of time as is the
case with many olais (Cadjans)
in some of the accounts.

5 For orders as to whether copy
may be given in the present
case from the entry in the
copy book.

6 It is also requested ... [illegible]
copies may be furnished ...
parties from the ...
the copy books ... and
in the record (...
of the several importa...
accounts in cases w...
...riginal cadjan le...

... disappeared having
torn owing to duration
...

[illegible signature in red]

...ed
28.10.96

Better inform applicant that the case is not ... I might ... to the coming ... certain ... give copy of the copy but should discourage such grant as much as possible.

... 29/10

...d
...h
...96

Thos

24 Proceedings of the Board of Reven
(Land Revenue).

Read — the following letter from
J. N. Atkinson Esq., Acting Collector of
the Kistna District, to the Secretary to
the Commissioner of Land Revenue,
dated Masulipatam, 15th November 1894
Current No 1518 — Eng.: —

Under rule 17 (3) of the revised
Board's Standing Order No 226, a reason-
-able fee in cash should be levied
for granting copies of maps or plans
and under rule 23, this fee should
paid in full to the copyist. I have the
honor to enquire whether it is the
intention of the Board that copies of
plans or maps need not be examined

Resolution. — dated 13th December 189
No 543.

The Board considers that cop
of maps & plans should be examined
... for od.

remuneration, as applications for such copies will be but few.

(True copy)

(Signed) L. M. Wynch
Secretary

(True copy)

S. Annasawmy
Second Assistant.

To
The Collector of
Madura.

(True copy)

Board of Revenue
(Land Revenue)

Proceedings No. $\frac{543}{13-12-94}$

25

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1897.

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

Printed May 28th.

Current No. 6
Date 16/6/97

Proceedings, No. 159, 13th May 1897.

Disposal No. 2206 of 1897

Communicated to all Divisional officers, Dy Collector, DTO Collector and all Dy Tahsildars, SC Supdt Dy SDty Submagts Tahsildars for information

MAY.

Order.—Amending paragraph 4 of — No. 226 (Old Edition).

25

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

(LAND REVENUE).

READ—the following letter from V. A. BRODIE, Esq., Collector of Gódávari, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Cocanada, 3rd May 1897, Cur. No. 2016-Ver. :—

Rule 4 of the rules regarding the inspection and grant of copies of public documents, published as revised Board's Standing Order No. 226, lays down that "if the search for a document should prove fruitless, the fee will not be refunded ; but the applicant can, on application, receive a certificate stating that the document or entry sought has not been found on record." I have the honour to enquire whether the application should be oral or written, and how the form of certificate should run. Under the existing practice, if the document is not found in the record, an endorsement to that effect is given to the party, as in the case of any other petition, without a further application either oral or written. If this is held sufficient (as I think it is), I would suggest that the rule may be amended accordingly by the omission of the words "on application."

RESOLUTION—No. 159, dated 13th May 1897.

Paragraph 4 of Standing Order No. 226 (Old Edition) will be amended as follows :—

For the words "but the applicant can, on application, receive a certificate," *substitute* "but the applicant will be furnished with a certificate."

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Secretary.

To all Collectors (D.Os.—Tahrs.).
,, the Conservators of Forests (D.F.Os.).
,, the Forest Settlement-officers.

Copy to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

26 Circular

All Sub-treasury Officers and Stationary Sub magistrates are hereby informed that as per Accountant General's Memorandum No. 34 of 26th Decr. '93 Remuneration to Copyists and Examiners may in future, be drawn on Establishment, instead of on Contingent Bill forms. The no. of sheets copied & examined should in each case be separately given and a certificate as to the total number copied and examined during the month also attached to the Bill as shown below:-

Examiners			
[illegible] Mudali	75 Sheets		1-9-..
Ramasami Aiyar	109	"	2-4-4
Copyists			
Chinnakesavalu Naidu	60	"	5-..-..
Adinarayana Rao	54	"	4-8-..
Chidambaram Pillai	70	"	5-13-4
	Total		

Certified that 184 sheets have been copied and examined during the month

The receipts of the payees need not be sent to this office with this form of Bill, the disbursing officer's certificate at the foot of the Bill being sufficient

[illegible]

Madura Collectorate
18th July 1894

Dy. Collector

[illegible]

18/7/94

Proc. No. 4372 of 18[illegible]

Dis No. 343
1897

27

The Manager of Kallalagar Devastanam applies for copy of the Fypal Dustik account of the said Kallalagar temple. The same has been sanctioned by the Collr.

In the record there are of F 1212 3 copies of the Dustik account, two in Tamil & one in Hindu..

above three are copies of one & the same thing, but none of them bear any signature.

The petitioner requests that a copy of the Tamil account may furnished to him.

For orders as to whether copy of the same may furnished.

A. Copy

is put up for perusal and return.

[illegible]
26.5.97.

Submitted to Collector for orders.

It is not desirable to give copies of unauthenticated documents [illegible]

Dy Collr.

[illegible]

Is there any reason to suspect genuineness – i.e. is it usual or unusual for such documents to be unsigned. If the former copy may be given noting prominently that it is unauthenticated

[illegible]
28.5.97

28

I think the search fee should be paid as often as a record has to be searched for

[illegible signature]

For orders.
M.L.
16-12-97

To B. Order
on the subject?
If not please
get one by
altering order
[illegible]
17/12/97

~~[illegible]~~

Chapter X paras 16 to 20 dea
with refund of the value of
Court Fee stamps. (Stamp
Manual herewith sent).

1. The case in question does not
seem to come under any of
the items therein referred to
to entitle the party for a refun

2. As soon as a search fee is
levied, the document is ~~[illegible]~~ searched
~~up~~ & kept in some cases with the applicatio
& the party informed of the
No. of stamp papers &c that
may be required & even
allowed to read the docum
if he so desires. Thus it will
be seen there will be no necess
for a fresh search of the same
document within one month's
time allowed for the deposit
of stamp papers &c. If

Stamps

stamp papers ~~are~~ are not deposited within the time allowed, the appln is dismissed & returned to the petitioner & the document replaced.

3. When a Court fee label is affixed to a petition & produced in court & accepted as a proper & cancelled one, I think the label sh'd be treated as 'used'.

~~Further in the case in question the document was picked up & the party informed of the no. of stamps required & the party has failed to deposit the stamp paper & called for~~. A search was made ~~further fees~~ paid &

a second search is to be made & a second fee should be paid I think. [initials]
16-12-97

For orders

29

Sreenivasa Vakil on behalf of the Pltff in S.S. 20 53 of 96 on the file of the Dt. Coty made a applied to him applied in October last & obtained sanction for him for a copy of the Judgment in the said suit and affixed a court fee stamp of 8 annas o/a search fees. The above application was dismissed & returned to the petitioner on 22-11-97, stamp papers not having been produced by him within one month as per notice published at page 320 of the Dt Gazette of 16-9-71.

He has now presented a fresh application for a copy of the said judgment duly sanctioned & argues that the search fee paid on the former petition which was disposed of, should be utilized towards the present one.

I doubt the right of the petitioner contention and think that a fresh search fee should be paid

15/12/97 M.S. 15-12-97

I think the Vakil's contention is reasonable. This question depends upon the solution of another viz whether he is not entitled to the refund of the court fee stamp paper app... but not used ... claim the refund under the rules (for which please see rules) ... Stamp rules) ... demand ... [illegible]

There is also another
view under which the
question may be
considered further.
You claim a search fee
& look into the record.
The man does not come
when you look into
the record but comes
some other day then.
You are obliged again
to look into it. Do
you demand fresh
fee? I think not.

When can the court fee
label affixed be said
to be "used". But now
when you have looked into
the record & apprise
the applicant of the
existence or nonexistence
of the record applied
for? please
take the question
in the light of the
above remarks
& let me know
your further
opinion

G
15-1-29

Let the
Dry colour drawing
be carried out
[initials]
28/7

Please show
me the last
f.o.

[initials]
25/7

Note for
E.H.C.

Kindly let me
have your remarks
on this

[initials]
25/7

I think the
present practice
is the best, or
there will be
the necessity
for drawing
refined [illegible]
constantly

[initials] 28/7

L.M.G. Dyer
Please file this.
[initials]
29/7/98

Sir
The Record Keeper's proposal
may be approved.

[illegible] for this is [illegible] drawing [illegible] D.G.S.

Memo for orders. 31

Ref. Office order No. 23 d. 25.7.98.

For Copies of Inam Registers &c, fees are levied in cash if the Huzur Recd. now salary system has been introduced among Copyists from 1st July 1898, fees levied in cash have to be remitted into the Huzur Treasury such amounts have in some cases to be levied approximately. They are now being remitted into the Treasury once a week after the Copies are Completed & the exact amount of Copying fees to be remitted into the Treasury after deducting Comparing fees due to Examiners & the excess amount to be returned to parties, if any, are ascertained. Begs orders to Continue the

the £ practice. The remittance book is sent herewith for perusal & return.

M. Subramaniyer
Ex. Record Keeper

25.7.98

~~Submitted for orders~~
~~through the English Head~~
~~Clerk~~

M.S.
27.6.98

~~In the order~~ of 1872

~~referred to~~ (Vide copy put up)

it is stated that copies of the Vern.

Register shd not be given as

they were simply compiled in the

Inam Commissioner's office & as they

are not statements presented by parties.

The artizan Inam Register about

which question is now raised

~~has~~ seems to be of a similar

nature. It is an extract in

Eng from the Karnam's accounts

compiled by the Inam Dy Colrs

office. The Inam Commissioner

has not passed final orders. There-

fore it seems doubtful whether

copies of the English Register could

be given.

Sd

Inams have Copies

shd not be granted.

Submitted for orders

I shd say grant them ... private

To
The Eng: Record Keeper

Sir,

C.G.No. 522 of 98
Rmg 412

The enclosed is an applicat...
for copies of the Inam Statement
& Inam Register for the Carpent...
& Blacksmith Inams of Sakkima...
galam & Uthangudi villages Mad...
Tq & the same has been sanctio...
by the Collector. Copies of
the above documents have
all along been sanctioned by
the Colr & furnished accordi...
to the parties. There is also
an order in 1872 to the effect
that copies of Inam State...
ments may be granted but
not of vernacular register...
prepared in the Settlement offi...
The English Head Clerk is of opi...
that copies of documents of the
above kind cannot be furnish...
to parties since as the ab...
Inams have not yet been f...
settled by the Inam Commr.
wants to take the Deputy Collecto...
orders on the point. I therefore
request you to obtain clear
instructions on the point for
my future guidance.

I beg to remain

Vol 74

enclosed is a summons from the Sub Court East to the Manager Sivaganga Estate for production of certain documents in OS No 27 of 98 on its file. No search fees has been received with the summons for the search of these C of Wds papers documents. There are search fees as is the case with regard to revenue documents.

From C.W. Procs. No 518/12.3.88 it will appear that petitions and applications to the Court of Wards & the Collector when acting as an agent of the Court of Wards require to be stamped while those to Managers of Estates are not required to be stamped.

It seems doubtful whether search fees can be claimed in case of C of Wds papers to be taken from the Manager's. Submitted for orders.

[illegible]
20/9/98

[illegible]
20/9/98

[illegible]

The rates fixed by the Dt. Judge is as follows.

'One rupee for the 1st paper, half rupee each for any additional papers required up to 9 & one fourth of a rupee for each subsequent paper.'

No doubt petitions don't require stamps but it seems to me that search fees should be paid for the trouble of taking the papers out.

[illegible]

34

[illegible]

[illegible]

12 . 8 . 1902

R. P. No 832/02

12.8.02

Sundararaja aiyangar of Tirupachetti applies for certified copies of the Istimrar accounts for Devadayam & Brahmadayam inams of Dharmasanam Sathanur village of Ramnad Zemindari. If originals be not available petitioner requests that copies of copies may be granted.

Note

In this case it appears that the original Cadjan accounts having been torn, copy thereof signed by the then Treasury Dy Collr is available.

For orders as to whether copy of the copy ~~signed~~ ~~Dy. Collr.~~ may be [illegible] The man[illegible]ol.

Copy of original if authenticated is sanctioned.

In cases in which unauthenticated copies of originals are available copy thereof is also granted with the remark that it is unauthenticated.

Attention is solicited in this connection to Mr. Twigg's orders on this subject (vide flag A & B in the file of papers put up)

For orders

[initials]
22.8.02.

Approved
[initials]
24.8.02

Record Keeper

Please have this filed. [initials]
26.8.02

Separate endorsement has been given to the[illegible]

35

Current No 2146/905
Account

reference & note
Papers — for perusal & orders
of the Reg Dfl[illegible]

Late Reg Dftltutori orders on
the subject put up in
file (flagged A.)

Para 4 ~~173~~ of SO No 173.
(Standing orders put up)

Latest B[illegible] No 249/LR reporting
4/10/05
the introduction of salary
system for examiners of
copies of documents (Put up
separately

[illegible]
30/10/05

No 23 [36]

Memo

Of the old records sorted ~~and marked D~~ by the Temporary Establishment ~~for sorting and indexing the old records~~, 23[5] Dufters and 19 files marked D as detailed ~~in the margin~~ below are eligible for immediate destruction. Sanction is therefore solicited for destroying the same.

[En]glish & Tamil Dufters	13[3]
[Ca]nduvi Dufters	92
Total	2~~3~~5
Sent Letters Files	4
Boards Files	9
Govt. Files	6
Total	19

Description of Records

1. D Papers of the Board Files of 1845–53.
2. ~~Do of~~ Sent Letter 1839, 1845 and 1846
3. ~~Do of~~ Govt. files of
4. ~~Mis.~~ Sent Letters of 1846
5. Census Records (correspondence) of 18[...]

[illegible]. Misc. papers &c of the Military Dept. up to 1887.

[illegible]. Sea Customs Records such as Shipping bills &c and Routine Correspondences of 1881-89.

8. Routine correspondence and returns of Special Funds of 1871-86.

9. Abkari returns &c of 1888-89

10. Routine correspondence of Local Funds of 1865-76 and 1880-87.

11. Correspondence regarding disbursements of pensions &c of 1887 and 1888.

12. Income Tax Routine Correspondence &c of 1886-88.

[illegible] Misc. Record such as routine [illegible]dences, applications [illegible]ntments, Reports on [illegible]tion of Treasuries &c [illegible]-71.

[illegible]ne correspondences of [illegible]cipality of 1879-86.

15. Misc. Correspondences Such as Progress Reports and Routine letters of the Public Works Dep. of 1878–82.

16. Magisterial Statements, correspondences &c of 1875–80 and 1883–84.

Vernacular Record

17. Jummahbundi &c records in Hinduvi Such as Kyfeits, averjahs &c of fuslies 1211–6.

18. Jummahbundy &c accounts in Tamil Such as Kyfeits, c demand accounts, collection returns, Season Reports, Statements of Irrigation Sources &c of fuslies 1263–93

19. Statements of cowl fuslies 1263–79.

20. Copy Petitions of 18 1882–91

21. Accounts relating to Trea Such as Contingent accounts.

of 1881-83 and 1886-91.

22. Sea Customs Records such as clearance Reports &c of 1884-85 and 1888-89.

23. Sea Customs Bills of entries &c of 1884-85 and 1888-89.

24. Misc: Records such as Sherish Files &c of 1886-91.

25 Misc: Records such as Puttah Transfer Registers and Returns &c of 1862-79.

26 ~~Misc~~ Statements such as cultivation accounts, Statements of expenditure on account of minors &c & routine correspondence relating to Estates [illegible] Court of wards of [illegible]

(oc)

No. 23

List of records [illegible]

[illegible]

old records eligible for [illegible]

21-10-95

(oc) [illegible]

38

R. S. Krishnaswami aiyar,
Copyist, will explain why
he stayed away on the 7th inst.
instant, without taking previous
permission. He should have
applied for & got the leave
beforehand instead of
staying away in anticipation
of his application being
sanctioned, which is against
the Collector's orders.

[illegible]
MAY 10 1909
English Head clerk

[illegible]
10.5.09.

Most Respected Sir,

I most humbly and respectfully beg to state that as I was obliged to go to Onelakkal to settle the family disputes then existing between my grand mother and my uncles which was unavoidable I applied for 3 days casual leave for this purpose before a week for which I was not allowed to go as English Copyist Sakrishna Ro[illegible]

Row: was on 6 days casual
leave. On account of my
urgency I was not able
to see that my leave is
sanctioned for which I
most humbly and respectfully
request that I should be
excused. Further I most
humbly beg to state that
I will be very careful in
future.

R. S. Krishnaswamy Iyer
Copyist.
11/5/09.

submitted
[illegible]
11. 5. 09

Subd. The
explu is most
unsatisfactory
[illegible]

MAY 11 1909

Please submit to the Collector
with a recommendation that
pay for the days of absence
may be stopped
[illegible]
11/5/09

Subd to the Collr. For
the Collr's orders re absence
in anticipation [illegible] leave
being granted [illegible] see fl
[illegible]

2 days pay deducted
from the pay bill
for May 09 as fine
as ordered.

The paper
may be
recorded
[illegible]

[illegible]
9. 6. 09

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] a fine.
Do this! I suppose there
is a definite time [illegible]
in which this absence should be
entered. I understand
that he applied for
leave which was refused
& that he then absented
himself without leave
He might have been
dismissed on the [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Entered in page 67.
[illegible]
1815

Respected Sir,

In the Inamdar statement there are the initials of the Deputy Collector & the fig[ures] are not clear. In the despatch account the [amou]nt itself is not clear. The other figures [?] of course a mistake. I beg to be excu[sed] this time. Hereafter I will be very caref[ul] in comparing

I beg to remain
Your most obedient
servant
T. V. Narayanaswami Aiyar
Examiner
10-6-09

39

Show the statement and account.
[initials]
12/6/09

In respect examiner is warned to be careful. In future the writer of the fair copy should not be the reader when the fair copy has to be compared: for if the writer has misread a word he would read as he read while copying.
[initials]
14/6/09

Seen
TVN
14/6/09

[illegible]
[initials]
14/6/09

Rd
14/6/09

[initials]
14/6

[initials]
14/6/09

[initials]
14/6/09

AB

Answer to the Additional Sub Collector's query d/ 13 Ante

The petitioner wants copies for the Inam Register and the statement of Peria kudakoil Village and for the Inam Register of Alavandan Village. A search fee of Rupee one and annas four was levied treating the accounts of each village as a separate document. Please see former Dy. Dy. Collector's note flagged A. Para 2 of S. O. No 173 is not clear on the point. The Inam Register and the Statement for the same village are treated as the same subject & search fees are levied 8 as & 4 as respectively.

Submitted through the Dy. Dy. Collector.

S
19.4.10

Submitted
T
19/4/10

Submitted
T...
19/4/10

F. Th.

Then the proper charge seems to be 1/8 not 1/4.

21/4

[illegible]

R 482 of 10

Note [illegible]

The Zemindar of [illegible] Zemindari [illegible] Taluk applies for copies of Inam Register for 15 Villages in his Zemin regarding Village Servants. He has affixed a court fee stamp of 12 As value on account of search fees saying that all the Villages are in one bound volume.

According to para 2, clauses (c) [illegible] of S.O. No 173, 8 annas should be levied for the 1st document and 4 as [illegible] for other additional documents, provided they are included in the same application and connected with the same subject.

The petitioner's contention is that one search fee should be levied as in the case of a magisterial file. Vide note 1 of para ~~1~~ 2 of the said S.O.

This practice was followed in this office for some time according to the sense of the Board's Standing Order. A doubt arose in 1896 as to the levy of search fees in the case of Jamabandy accounts of several Villages (Cadjan documents) which are tied up in one bundle. A note was put up for the orders of the late Dy. Collector on the subject. He has ordered that the accounts of each Village should be treated as a separate document. Vide flag C.

The same doubt was arisen [illegible] while Mr. [illegible] [illegible] Actg. Sub Collector [illegible] the previous [illegible]

~~that~~ search fee at the rate of Rs. 1/8
is being levied for each village
treating them as separate documents
Please see the order (flag E).

It is therefore submitted
that the petitioner may be informed
that he should pay search fee
for each village separately
& that the fact of the Inam Register
of several villages being bound
in one volume will not be
ta[illegible] into consideration for
the purpose of levying search fee.
& that the search fee is intended
for maintaining the records
& is for the ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]
~~[illegible] petitioner [illegible]~~
amount of labour involved
in each case [illegible]

S[illegible]
4/8
D. 4/8/[illegible]

V[illegible] 6/8/[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Flag A
20/[illegible]

Kodikulam Gaut village the required due.

I therefore, request that you will be good enough to send me a copy of the said ~~[illegible]~~ belonging to Agga (Gaut) Kodikulam village, the title deed No for the Inam being No. 986.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedt Servant

[illegible] Clerk

No. 29

Ref.

Encl. one

I have the honor to state that the Title-deed No. 986 referred to appertains ~~belongs~~ to Ammachiyar Inam of Vaghaikulam village and that there is no mention ~~Inam~~ of Ayen Kodikulam village [illegible]

[illegible]

31-10 Record keeper

L. 388

189 ... DEPARTMENT.

~~Collector's~~ Office.

FROM

THE ~~Treasury Dy. Collector~~ Tahsildar of Tirumangalam

TO

THE English Record Keeper Collectorate Madura

Dated 28 } October 1895.
Despatched

No. 5743

ENCLOSURE 1.

REFERENCE :— His Endorsement No. 31/1.11.94

Sir

In returning herewith the copy of the Register for perusal of Kodikulam, I have the honor to inform you that the Inam referred to in the ... belongs to Kodikulam ... of Saptur Zemin ...

No. 25

Madura Collector
22/11/95

Recd 23/10/95

From

The Huzur Record keeper,
Madura.

To

The Tahsildar of Melur

Sir,

With reference to your R. Dis No 27 dated the 11th October 95 to the address of the Head Deputy Collector, I have the honour to state there are 5 kinds of Inams as stated below and it is not known for which of these Inams the extract is required for your disposal.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant
M Subramaniya
Record keep

As per Inam Register of Tirumang

Devadayam Inams in Amu

(1) For the support of the pagoda of Meenad
-waral - Thanapha Inchili Arakka

(2) Do Do

(3) Do Do

(4) Do Do of Bili

Eg. No 2993
30/10

has the honour to state
that it unto do if
pursuant of a duty the
Rejauces (item No 3)
is cent.

Ag Tahsildar

Extract sent
with endorsement
C. No 4953
15 10 95 on 4 11 95
file

Rd. No. 31.

Endorsement 27-1-96.

Rc. 25 / Rt. 25-1-96

To The Govt. Pleader
Madura

Sir,

With reference to Collector's order Rc. No. 387 / 27-1-96 on your letter No. 32 / 25-1-96 directing me to comply with your request directly I have the honor to state that from the arzee Register it appears that the Manager's arzee No. 1 of 1875 with connected papers have been destroyed & that the Ahaval account of the year 1862 is not to be found in the records, but that for 1863 is available.

2. I have to inform

you further that the letter
No 12 received by you & i.e.
search fee Re 1 due to Govt.
may be sent to this office
at an early date.

Through
[illegible]

27-1-96

To
The Dy. Collector
Madura Dn.

Respected Sir,

With reference to your memo. or R Rev No 3253 / 11-10-85 I beg to forward herewith (1) ... office letter No. 495 / 17-10-81 to Coll... (2) Collector's decision in ... appeal No. 33 of 81 & to state that letter No. 79 / 4-2-82 has already been sent to your office (vide my report No. 22 dated 11-10-85).

As regards Collector's letter No. 663 / 11-3-82 to the Ex. Engineer I beg to state that it does ... appear to have been ...

delivered into the Record room.

Agra Schooling for

~~[illegible]~~ letter no. 1621

26-5-82

in which [illegible] I will

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

No 3
R.D.

To

The Dep. Dt. Collector
Madura
through the English
Head Clerk

Respected Sir,

I beg respectfully to bring to notice that the work of the 3 Temporary clerks who are engaged in sorting English papers in the Reg. per Records is not satisfactory from the beginning of the current month. The 4th clerk is arranging Marata papers & ...

Their work is detailed below:—

Work turned out by the above 3 Clerks—

Date	
2.3.96	Indexed papers already sorted
3rd Do	Do
4th	new work — Duftr 1.
5th	Do — ½
6 & 7th	Do — ½
(8 Sunday)	
9th	one clerk Ramasawmy ... on leave from this date
The other 2 clerks	Index comparing —
9th	Do
10th	
11th	one clerk was relieved & with the assistance of the new clerk ... new work — Duftr ½

12th March		New work	Dufts ½
13th Do		Do	" 1 ½
14th Do		Do	" 2
Total amount of duftas during the fortnight			Dufts 5 ½

The 2nd English clerk in charge of the temporary work has, I understand applied for 1 month privilege

I therefore humbly request that an experienced hand may be deputed for the work in his place so that the work of the temporary clerk may be ~~vigorously~~ vigorously prosecuted in order that sufficient progress may be shown at the end of the quarter.

(Sd) ML

6/3/76

Appendix 4

Tables

Showing Working Of

Upper And Lower Reservoirs

if the Power Scheme had been in operation between the years

1896-1904

47

No. 6 48 Madura Collr's Office 6 Septr, 96.

To
The Sub Collector
Dindigul

[illegible]

Respected Sir,

In obedience to your order Roc No. 928/1.9.96, I beg to state that I have caused the Hindwi accounts in the Huzur Record to be examined by one Rama Rao, a Temporary Record Clerk who knows the language & his report is enclosed herein. From this it would appear that there are no artizans Inams in the Zemindaree of Palni Taluk.

I beg to remain,
(Sd) [illegible]

(Rama Rao's report)

1207 [illegible] 1213 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible signature]

Tpy Clerk
15-9-46